		1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	X 24-MJ-1204	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff	
5	Vs. Buffalo, New York	
6	PETER CELENTANO, October 18, 2024 Defendant	
7	X	
8	TRANSCRIPT OF INITIAL APPEARANCE	
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JEREMIAH J. MCCARTHY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
10	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE CODGE	
11	U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE	
12	BY: JEFFREY INTRAVATOLA, ESQ. 138 Delaware Avenue	
13	Buffalo, New York 14202 Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff	
14	GALLO & IACOVANGELO LLP BY: JAMES SCOTT WOLFORD, ESQ.	
15	180 Canal View Boulevard Suite 100	
16	Rochester, New York 14623	
17	Appearing on behalf of the Defendant	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	COURT REPORTER: Brandi A. Wilkins scalisba@gmail.com	
24	Kenneth B. Keating Federal Building 100 State Street, Room 1250A	
25	Rochester, New York 14614	

2 THE CLERK: All rise. 1 2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be 3 seated. 4 THE CLERK: On the record in criminal 5 proceeding 24-MJ-1204, United States of America vs. 6 Peter Celentano for an initial appearance on criminal 7 complaint. Present in the courtroom are Assistant U.S. Attorney Jeffrey Intravatola. Defendant with 8 9 attorney James Wolford. United States Probation Officer Andre McCrae. The Honorable Jeremiah J. 10 11 McCarthy presiding. 12 THE COURT: Good afternoon again. 13 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Good afternoon, Your 14 Honor. 15 MR. WOLFORD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Celentano, you are named in 16 a criminal complaint dated October 17, 2024. Have you 17 received a copy of the complaint and the supporting 18 19 affidavit? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I'm reading it now. THE COURT: Okay. Would you briefly 21 22 summarize the charges and the potential penalties, Mr. 23 Intravatola. 24 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Yes, Your Honor. 25 a single count in the complaint which is for illegal

possession of machine guns. It states that on or about September 29 of 2024 in the Western District of New York the defendant Peter Celentano did knowingly possess machine guns to wit two machine gun conversion devices used to modify semi automatic firearms to fire as fully automatic weapons enabling said firearms to automatically shoot more than one shot without manual reloading by a single function of the trigger and 59 AR style lower receivers containing automatic seer pinholes all in violation of Title 18 United States Code Sections 922(o) and 924(a)(2), and for this charge, Your Honor, the maximum penalty is a term of imprisonment of 10 years, a maximum fine of \$250,000, a maximum term of supervised release of three years and there's no mandatory minimum.

THE COURT: Thank you. Sir, you have the right to remain silent. You cannot be compelled to testify against yourself. You have the right to be represented by an attorney, and if you cannot afford an attorney, one will be appointed for you. Mr. Wolford, are you fully retained?

MR. WOLFORD: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Defendant is also entitled to a preliminary hearing to determine whether the charges of the complaint are

4 supported by probable cause. Do you wish to have a 1 2 hearing? 3 MR. WOLFORD: Not at this time, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. WOLFORD: But would reserve my right to 6 ask for said hearing. 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WOLFORD: But I'm not asking for one at 8 this time. 9 THE COURT: All right, thank you. You will 10 11 reserve that right. 12 MR. WOLFORD: Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Is the Government seeking 14 detention? 15 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Yes, Your Honor. Government would be moving for detention under 18 16 17 United States Code Section 3142(f)(1)(e). I'm happy to be heard on that right now, Judge, or continue the 18 19 detention hearing to a later date if the Court would 20 prefer. I would note that we are not yet in possession of the final bail report, so I leave that 21 22 to the Court whether we'd like to conduct that today 23 or perhaps early next week. 24 THE COURT: Is this a presumption case? 25 MR. INTRAVATOLA: It's not a presumption

case, Your Honor. However, I would note that under the statute, defendant buys to be detained pending that detention hearing.

THE COURT: Right. Mr. Wolford, what's your preference as to a detention hearing?

MR. WOLFORD: Well, obviously, Your Honor, I would object to my client being detained until the detention hearing. If we're in fact going to have a motion for detainment, we're ready to proceed with that right now. If the Court is willing to or is going to adjourn it or schedule it for next week, we'd ask that my client stay out of custody.

I would like to point out for the Court that my client self surrendered after being notified by me last night that there was a criminal complaint for him, and he obviously was here and we were in constant contact. So my request would be that if we are going to have that hearing we would do it but my client would remain out of custody until said time.

THE COURT: Okay. Has he been interviewed?

OFFICER MCCRAE: Yes, Judge. He has been interviewed.

THE COURT: Okay. Can you give me an oral report?

25 OFFICER MCCRAE: Yes. So the defendant

reported that he was born in Lipskin, New York. He denied possessing any passport or international travel documents. He is a U.S. citizen. He reported residing at 23 Rochester Street in Bergen, New York, with his wife and five-year-old son. The defendant did report possessing five to ten long guns which are -- were located inside of his residence.

He advised that he has a pistol permit but it's temporarily been taken by authorities. The defendant stated that his mother and three siblings all reside in the Long Island, New York area. He denied any history of domestic violence. He reported that he has a doctorate degree in music from Stony Brook University. He denied any military history.

The defendant described his physical health as fair and advised that he is prescribed six to seven medications for various allergies, acid reflux and asthma. He denied any mental health treatment or diagnosis and the same for substance abuse. No substance abuse issues or prior treatment. The defendant is employed with Amazon and has been for the past seven years as a specialist solution architect, and he makes approximately \$190,000 a year. Prior to that he was employed with a consulting firm for two and a half years.

He owns his residence. Very limited liabilities. Has about \$10,000 in a joint checking account. And no prior criminal history. Our only concern honestly is the firearms located inside of the residence at this time and the nature of the charges.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a recommendation?

OFFICER MCCRAE: We would like to verify this information prior to putting a recommendation on the record.

THE COURT: Okay. And do you want a proffer? Go ahead.

MR. INTRAVATOLA: Yes, Judge. So our detention recommendation here is kind of two prompt. First, we have the nature of this case, and then we have what the investigation has kind of uncovered about the defendant over the past few days.

So the nature of this case is fairly self explanatory. We have a significant volume of machine guns that were recovered from defendant, but more so we have defendant's conduct after that initial search warrant was executed at his house. He had additional firearms as outlined in the affidavit, and he went to various places to secret them away.

So in this case, we have of course an

instance where probation will need to do a home inspection. They'll need to do various check ups on defendant as they do, and we don't know necessarily that we have every single firearm that's been recovered in this case, Judge. Now, that's especially a concern because of the second prong of why we are seeking detention here.

The investigation has uncovered -- and this is part of why I thought maybe next week would be better because I haven't had a chance to of course provide anything to defendant or the Court yet, but law enforcement has reviewed defendant's social media accounts and to put it mildly, they are troubling. I have some excerpts from the social media accounts. As I noted I haven't had a chance to provide them to the Court or defendant yet, but if I could read some excerpts from them, I'd like to do so.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. INTRAVATOLA: So these were from Twitter or X, posts on Twitter or X. We have an instance where defendant posted an individual holding a sign that says fuck cops. We have -- and I'm just reading a selection of these, Judge. I don't want to take the Court's time, but there are numerous posts.

We have an instance where defendant posted

an individual holding what looks to be an automatic 1 2 rifle saying that your rights are being stripped away 3 by people with names and addresses. Of course the 4 implication being there that individuals like myself or others in law enforcement have names and addresses. 5 6 Particularly troubling. 7 THE COURT: Does that indicate names and 8 addresses or no? 9 MR. INTRAVATOLA: No, Judge. It's more the 10 implication that --11 THE COURT: Okay. MR. INTRAVATOLA: -- we're people with names 12 13 and addresses and it begs the question why. 14 THE COURT: Right. MR. INTRAVATOLA: Why would someone be 15 mentioning that? And I'm also happy to provide this 16 17 up to the Court, Judge. I have several copies if you are interested, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: No. Just you can continue your 20 comments. 21 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Okay. We have a meme 22 that's the Simpsons. This one probably makes more 23 sense to view, but there's an image of Homer Simpson 24 in a bathtub with the caption American gun owners with 25 Bart Simpson standing behind him holding a chair

implying that he would hit him with the chair saying infringements for protection followed by an image of Homer Simpson holding a chair behind Bart Simpson with the caption over the chair being 3D printers, Homer Simpson being captioned with reasonable people pushed to be unreasonable and Bart Simpson being captioned with big Government thinking they did something.

This post is seemingly a brief post of another individual's comments on Twitter saying LOL fuck the AFT, which I can describe in a second, and their warnings. I'm here to arm the masses. The background behind that, Judge, is as I understand it President Biden mistakenly referred to the ATF as AFT at one point. So there are some internet memes going around joking that the ATF is the AFT.

Additionally, there was an image of I believe this is Mr. Rogers from the popular children's show back in the day and it's captioned if they send one of yours to the hospital send six of theirs to the morgue. Additionally, there was a post that's captioned and basically there's a monster behind what appears to be a federal agent and it says when the Feds track you down to your Appalachian cave home but you've been training in actual fucking wendingo which I believe is the monster in guerilla warfare after

feeding him chicken tenders and Bang energy which is an energy drink for the past six months, and then again, there's a creature post threateningly behind the individual who appears to be a federal agent.

And then lastly, Judge, and I won't go
through all of these but there was an inquiry on a
Reddit post, Reddit being another social media
network, and the -- that forum on Reddit is captioned
Reddit legal advice off topic where people go to seek
legal advice sometimes anonymously under their screen
names. And the question there was is it illegal to
tell a cop to kill themselves, just wondering.

And so again, that was just a sampling,

Judge, but posts of this nature naturally raise a red

flag for us. We have an individual who has already

demonstrated that when confronted with law enforcement

and the search warrant at his home he did not turn

over additional firearms. He went and hid them

places, and now we have someone whose online persona

espouses these anti Government sort of fringe violent

views against federal agents, and so in my view,

Judge, these nature and circumstances of this case in

addition to the background of defendant that he's

demonstrated through these posts and through his

conduct in this case, detention seems clear cut here,

Judge, because there are dangerous posts there, and we see in the news all the time individuals who make similar posts like this and what they go on to do, and in my view, Judge, it's -- it's too dangerous to let an individual like this back out into society particularly when we have probation agents or probation officers who in effect are Feds going to monitor a defendant.

They're going to have to come into contact with the defendant every single time they need to do an update. And we certainly can't take the risk that Court staff will be put in dangerous situations given the firearms in this case and given defendant's views.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Wolford?

MR. WOLFORD: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

Appreciate that. Well, I guess I'll address who my
client is first as far as obviously pre-trial
indicated he has no prior criminal history. He's been
a lifelong resident of New York. He married his wife
who is from this area or actually Batavia and moved
back up here in 2015, bought his home with his wife in
2018.

As indicated by pre-trial, he does have a master in music. He did attend Potsdam to receive his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

under graduate degree and graduated high school at
Bellport and is a self taught IT consultant, engineer
and was working for a company called Open Source
Consulting Group which was ultimately acquired by
Amazon, and since holding his position at Amazon for
the past I believe eight years, he's received a number
of promotions. He's now working on principal level
positions dealing with executives and what have you.

His wife who I don't know if was able to confirm some of the information provided to pre-trial is at church. They're both very involved in the church. He sings in the choir, attends men's group and has a son with his wife. I reviewed the affidavit a couple of times, reviewed the complaint, and as far as what I can glean here, my client what was discovered at his house were two machine gun conversion devices. From what's detailed in the affidavit here, and I believe it was prior to the search warrant being executed because it says here at paragraph 10, prior to the execution of the search warrant at 23 Rochester Street, and that's my client's address, they obtained a search warrant, GPS monitor and that's where they followed him to Lakeshore Road. I didn't read any allegation of after the execution of the search warrant that my client then went and was

disseminating property throughout the area or what have you. So that was news to me from hearing that from the Government from the proffer.

What we have here obviously in the affidavit are two separate homeowners who had property at their house that the Government believes was illegal and are saying that it's my client's. So I would point that out for the Court that we have just two of the items identified in the complaint, these two machine gun conversion devices and have two individuals instead of saying that's my gun or my equipment they're pointing the finger at my client.

Now, we don't have as typical as the Court would receive for confidential informants. We've used them in the past. They're reliable in the past. We have no credibility determinations made here in the affidavit as far as supporting the land owner's version of events. Now we have social media accounts. And I would like to add that there's no accusations that my client took any of these items that were discovered and was disseminating them, selling them, using them in any type of fashion whatsoever.

So all we have is essentially from the affidavit is that my client is being accused of having possession and control over these items that were not

found at his residence. Now my client's being made out to be that we can't even have a probation officer go to his house that he's so dangerous. Well, there's no indication that my client made any overt threats to anyone. We're going off of social media accounts. There's no accusations that my client used any of these rifles or firearms and threatened anyone with them. There's none of those accusations. In my opinion, this is speculation on the part of the Government at this proffer to keep my client detained.

Now, as I indicated prior, my client self surrendered here. He's going to make all of his Court appearances. He has a home in Bergen. He has a job with Amazon. He's going to show up for all of his Court appearances, so the likelihood of him doing that is very high. There's been no warrants. There's been no type of contact with law enforcement prior to this.

So in my opinion there are compelling reasons and we can set some conditions of release. If it's monetary bail that the Court would like or some type of monitored home confinement, electronic monitoring, there are reasonable accommodations that we can come up with with pre-trial to ensure that my client makes all of the Court appearances.

So for those reasons, Your Honor, and based

upon my client's history, I would ask that he would 1 2 not be detained and also based upon what I 3 characterize very weak proof here that my client 4 possessed all of these firearms that the Government is 5 claiming that he possessed. Thank you. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Your Honor, if I could 8 briefly just respond. 9 THE COURT: Yes. MR. INTRAVATOLA: Clarify some things. 10 11 First, I would just note that nothing what I just 12 heard about defendant's background negates our 13 concerns from a danger standpoint. In fact, defense 14 counsel noted that defendant is highly tech savvy. He 15 has a good facility with the internet and computers. This ability compounds our concerns because I've 16 17 already gone through the posts that he's made online and the reach that those could have on a social media 18 site like Twitter or X. 19 20 Additionally, and I forgot to mention this 21 earlier, defendant -- as part of this investigation 22 we've learned that defendant in fact uses the internet 23 to distribute and potentially sell what are his own 24 schematics for 3D printed firearms, and so this

facility with electronics and the potential that an

25

individual who is savvy with electronics to hide or cover his tracks or his behavior is especially concerning.

And Judge, with respect to the sufficiency of the evidence, I would note that law enforcement lawfully obtained a GPS tracker monitor on the individual's vehicle which is how they found the additional guns in the first place. They followed him and his path was unusual which is what led them to — one of the several places that he hid firearms.

So that was just a brief response, Judge, but the theory that the individual at one of those places cooperated and then somehow, you know, led to his son, another individual who is also in possession of firearms from the defendant, it doesn't quite make sense that they would all be willfully cooperating with the Government when there was no -- there's no reason to go out of their way to reach out to the Government about these additional firearms. And so for that reason, Judge, I don't believe that the sufficiency argument is persuasive either.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to hold this hearing open. I want a more detailed written report.

I appreciate your oral summary that you gave me. We can schedule whenever you want next week as soon as

you want, Mr. Wolford. There is no criminal history 1 2 right now. That's a factor. I'm only going to 3 address conditions between now and the continuation of 4 the hearing. Okay? So I'm going to release him but 5 on a \$50,000 signature bond to be signed by him. 6 other family members are here today. Right? 7 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Correct. THE COURT: Okay. Coupled with the 8 9 admonition that he not violate state, federal or local law. I'm not going to send pre-trial out to his house 10 11 right now because I do have concerns in that regard but we'll revisit those issues next week. When do you 12 13 want to have a hearing? 14 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Judge, if we could have 15 it -- Monday is bad for the Government. If possible Tuesday or later. I'm generally flexible otherwise. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WOLFORD: Tuesday would be fine, Your 18 Honor. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. Let me --21 MR. WOLFORD: I have something at 10:00 in 22 front of Judge Pedersen. 23 THE COURT: Okay. How about maybe 2 in the 24 afternoon? 25 MR. WOLFORD: That would be fine.

THE COURT: Does that work for you? 1 2 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Just one moment -- that 3 would work for the Government, Judge. 4 THE COURT: Andre, does that work for you? 5 OFFICER MCCRAE: That's fine. 6 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Judge, however, I would 7 move for a stay pending appeal of the Court's decision today. We plan to appeal the Court's decision to 8 9 release defendant. THE COURT: Well, I'll give you until 5:00, 10 11 but --MR. INTRAVATOLA: Understood, Judge. 12 THE COURT: Otherwise -- otherwise, he'll be 13 14 released for the weekend. 15 MR. INTRAVATOLA: Okay. Understood, Judge. 16 THE COURT: Okay. So he'll sign the bond 17 today and the -- and the preliminary conditions of release. You understand, sir, that you will be 18 19 signing this bond. If you violate any of the 20 conditions of your release, you'll be liable -- in 21 addition to criminal consequences, you'll be liable 22 for the sum, the amount of the bond. Do you 23 understand that, sir? 24 THE DEFENDANT: I do. 25 THE COURT: All right. Okay. That will be

my ruling and I'll give you until 5:00 to obtain a stay, not seek a stay. Otherwise, he'll be released. MR. INTRAVATOLA: Understood, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. MR. WOLFORD: Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceeding concluded at 1:25 p.m.) CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER I certify that this is a true and accurate record of proceedings in the United States District Court for the Western District of New York before the Honorable Jeremiah J. McCarthy on October 18, 2024. S/ Brandi A. Wilkins Brandi A. Wilkins Official Court Reporter